REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 1-22 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added.

By way of summary, the Official Action presents the following issue: Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over Farris et al. (U.S. Patent 6,154,207, hereinafter "Farris").

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Official Action is rejected Claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over Farris. The Official Action contends that Farris discloses all of the Applicants' claimed features. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By way of background, electronic program guides (EPGs) are known and frequently employed in digital television signals. The EPG is utilized for identifying scheduling of predetermined programs. However, analog broadcast signals do not lend themselves as well to transmitting such associated information without significant difficulty.[1]

In light of at least the above deficiencies in the art, the present advancements are provided. With at least the above objects in mind, a brief comparison of the claimed advancements in view of the cited references, believed to be in order.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a broadcast signal transmitting apparatus, including:

> a multiplexer configured to multiplex a broadcast signal and multimedia data, said multimedia data described by a mark-up language and including broadcast program information, link location information, control signals providing display control to a receiver and control signals providing recording control to a recording medium; and

[1] Application at page 1.

a transmitter configured to transmit said broadcast signal and said multimedia data multiplexed in said multiplexer to said receiver.

Farris describes an authoring tool which may be utilized by a user to eliminate undesired language from an audio source. A digital entertainment terminal (DET) is provided to interact with service providers (VIPs) for the purpose of offering a wide array of video and interactive multi-media services.[2] The DET may download application software and/or operating system information from one or more VIPs. The DET communicates with asset and object servers to develop an interactive multimedia application.[3] Such an asset or object server is identified in Figure 9 as a prior art broadband network for providing interactive services.[4] As shown in Figure 9, a level 1 gateway (921) is provided for management functionality such as billing and session management. Likewise, a level 2 gateway is provided for supplying transmission of menus of available information to subscribers.[5]

In operation, dynamic programming of the DET is provided to dynamic programming includes generating an interactive decision list (IDL) and an edit decision list (EDL). An example of such a dynamic programming would be to utilize the authoring tool on a personal computer (1240) such that the user invokes assets and objects of the servers and integrates them into an interactive program. Specifically, the user can schedule the interactive modules of the invention to create or modify a stop word list to eliminate undesirable language.[6]

Conversely, Claim 1 recites an exemplary advancement in the art in which a broadcast signal transmitting apparatus includes a multiplexer which is configured to multiplex a broadcast signal and multimedia data. The multimedia data is described by a mark-up

[2] Farris at column 14, lines 48-52.
[3] Farris at column 15, lines 1-3.
[4] Farris at column 15, line 65 through column 16, line 5.
[5] Farris at column 17, lines 10-51.
[6] Farris at column 20, lines 20-30.

language and includes broadcast program information, link location information, control signals providing display control to a receiver, and control signals providing recording control to a recording medium. A transmitter is provided to transmit the broadcast signal and the multimedia data multiplexed to a receiver. While the Official Action has cited Figure 9 of Farris as describing the transmission of a multiplex broadcast signal together with a mark-up language, Applicants note that no such system is shown or described in Figure 9. For example, while column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 27 refer to a "hypertext reference to an object", this passage simply refers to functionality which may be provided during the editing of assets through a video editor. As can be appreciated, the transmission of a broadcast signal multiplexed together with mark-up language data is wholly different than creating multimedia objects at a production station. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and any claim depending therefrom is allowable over the cited reference. Likewise, as independent Claims 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, and, 20-22 recite substantially similar limitations as that discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims and any corresponding dependent claims are likewise allowable over the cited reference.

Further, with respect to Claim 2, the Official Action has cited column 3, lines 43-58 of Farris as teaching the delay of multimedia transmission until a time different from that of a corresponding broadcast program signal. Applicants note that the passage cited in the Official Action has to do with the incorporation of multimedia elements into a playback timeline at a video editing production station. As can be appreciated, there is no disclosure, or suggestion, in this passage, or any other in Farris of separately broadcasting multimedia data at a delayed time with respect from its corresponding broadcast program signal. For example, such multimedia data may be provided as control signals of a broadcast television

signal provided during late night hours.[7] Farris does not disclose, or suggest, this more detailed aspect of the Applicants' advancements.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

As Applicants have not substantively amended the claims in response to any rejection of record, should a further rejection be applied and a next action based upon newly cited prior art, Applicants submit that such an action **cannot properly be considered a final Office Action**.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application, including Claims 1-22, is patentably distinguished over the prior art, in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866

BDL:SAM\dt
I:\ATTY\SAM\PROSECUTION WORK\245758\AMDT DUE 2AUG06.DOC

[7] Application at page 6.